

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

CHILD TRENDS INCORPORATED,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 25-1479-ABA
v.	)	
	)	
ROBERT F. KENNEDY, JR., in his Official	)	
Capacity as Secretary of Health and Human	)	
Services, <i>et. al.</i>	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
*****		
CHILD TRENDS INCORPORATED, <i>et. al.</i>	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 25-1154-BAH
v.	)	
	)	
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, <i>et. al.</i> ,	)	
	)	

**NOTICE OF RELATED CASE**

Pursuant to Local Rule 103 of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, Defendants Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., and Andrew Gradison (“Defendants”), hereby notify both the Court and the parties who have appeared before the Court in the above-captioned case that the instant case is related to the case entitled *Child Trends, Inc., et al., v. Department of Education, et al.*, Case No. 25-cv-1154-BAH, in that they are both brought by Plaintiff Child Trends, Inc. (“Plaintiff”) and are both related to the legality of government grant terminations. Defendants file this notice to inform the Court of the two cases and provide a brief description of each.

On April 7, 2025, the Jacobson Lawyers Group PLLC filed *Child Trends, Inc., et. al., v. Department of Education, et al.* (“*Child Trends I*”), on behalf of Plaintiff and RMC Research Corporation. Plaintiffs in *Child Trends I* allege that recent grant terminations by the Department

of Education were unlawful for, among other reasons, alleged constitutional violations. Plaintiffs ask the Court to declare that the grant terminations were unlawful and enjoin the Department of Education from enforcing the terminations.

On May 7, 2025, the Jacobson Lawyers Group PLLC filed *Child Trends, Inc., et. al., v. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., et al.* (“*Child Trends II*”), on behalf of Plaintiff. In *Child Trends II*, Plaintiff alleges that potential grant terminations without the right to notice and a hearing would violate Plaintiff’s due process rights. Plaintiff asks the Court to declare that a termination without notice and a hearing is unlawful and enjoin Defendants from terminating the grants.

As this Court noted in its May 9, 2025, order denying Plaintiff’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order without notice, *Child Trends 2* “is likely to present disputes over jurisdiction...” ECF 9 at 3. The jurisdictional issues in *Child Trends I* and *Child Trends II* both relate to whether government grant termination related cases are properly brought before the district court. This jurisdictional issue has been fully briefed in *Child Trends I* and is currently under review. Defendants believe a substantial duplication of labor will occur if *Child Trends II* is not assigned to the same judge.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly O. Hayes  
United States Attorney

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Tianna Bethune  
Assistant United States Attorney  
36 S. Charles Street, Fourth Floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21201  
410-209-4922  
[Tianna.Bethune@usdoj.gov](mailto:Tianna.Bethune@usdoj.gov)  
*Counsel for Defendants*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on May 14, 2025, I caused a copy of the above *Notice of Related Case* to be electronically served upon all parties receiving CM/ECF notices in this case.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Tianna Bethune  
Assistant United States Attorney